





## THE SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERALISTS, I.

ORIGINAL material for Southern history has been so scarce at the centres where American historiographers have worked, that the general writers have had to substitute conjecture for understanding in many cases when attempting to interpret Southern developments. The Federalists of the South have suffered particularly from misrepresentation and neglect. Their Democratic-Republican contemporaries of course abused them; the American public at large in the following generation was scandalized by the course of the New England Federalists, and placed a stigma upon all who bore or had borne the name of Federalists anywhere; no historical monographs have made the pertinent data available; and the standard historians, with the exception of Henry Adams, who has indicated a sound interpretation in the form of conjecture but who has given no data, have failed to handle the theme with any approach to adequacy. The South Carolina group appears to have been typical of the whole Southern wing of the Federalists; and because of the greater fullness of the extant documents and the more apparent unity of the theme, the present essay will treat of the origin, character and early career of the party in the state where it was most prominent, rather than in the Southern region at large.

South Carolina has always been in large degree a community apart from the rest of the United States. The long isolation of the colony upon an exposed frontier, and the centralization of commercial, social and political life by reason of the great importance of the city of Charleston, had given the commonwealth a remarkable sentiment of compactness and self-reliance. In the whole period from the Revolution to the Civil War the tendency of public opinion generally prevailing was to regard the membership of their state in the Federal Union as merely providing a more or less intimate alliance of the states, as mutual convenience might require. The stress of somewhat abnormal conditions, however, led many prominent men in the state to favor strong powers for the federal government throughout the period from 1786 to the time of the "second war for American independence", in 1812-1815.

In the internal politics of South Carolina, an aristocracy composed of the planters and the leading Charleston merchants was

generally in control of the state government, but was in chronic dread of defeat at the ballot-boxes. In the opposition there was a body of clerks, artisans and other white laborers in Charleston, much inclined at times to assert democratic doctrine, and there was a large population of farmers in the distant uplands, non-slaveholding in the eighteenth century, disposed to co-operate with the submerged Charleston democracy on occasion, but rendered partly helpless by a lack of leaders and organization. The control by the planters, furthermore, was safeguarded by a constitutional gerrymander which gave their districts (the lowlands) a more than proportionate representation in the legislature; and this advantage was jealously guarded by the planters, who feared unsympathetic administration, if no worse, by the democracy. The planters were large producers on a capitalistic basis, analogous to factory owners of more recent times, and often they operated on credit. They were generally disposed to be conservative in business, anxious to keep their credit good and to maintain friendly relations with the commercial powers.<sup>1</sup> In addition, these men, who were residents among and rulers of a dense negro population, could not afford to accept and propagate such socially disturbing ideas as the doctrine of the inherent freedom and equality of men. The danger of fomenting servile discontent was too great.

In most of its problems except where the negroes were concerned the South Carolina ruling class found its interests to be harmonious with those of the Northern sea-board; and the problems of negroes and slavery furnished no overt issues in that period which could not be speedily patched up. The more obvious problems before the whole country were such as to promote little antagonism between North and South. All states and sections had similar tasks of rehabilitation after the war, similar needs of establishing an effective central government, similar difficulties of finance and commerce, similar danger from the French agitation in the Genet period, similar problems in general of maintaining a suitable equilibrium between social compactness and personal liberty and between national unity and local self-government. In nearly all the ques-

<sup>1</sup> The importance of commercial relations to the plantation interests may be gathered from the statistics of exports. For example, in 1791 the exports of South Carolina were valued at 2.9 million dollars, as compared with 3.8 from Pennsylvania, 3.5 from Virginia, 2.0 from Massachusetts and 2.5 from Maryland. In 1800 they were, from South Carolina 10.6 million dollars, from New York 1.4, from Maryland 12, from Pennsylvania 12, from Massachusetts 11.3, from Virginia 4.4.

tions of the period the issues lay between classes of people differentiated by temperament, occupation and property-holding, rather than between sections antagonized by the pressure of conflicting geographical conditions and needs. The temperament of the South in general was more impulsive than that of the North, and therefore its views were likely to be the more democratic in that period of democratic agitation; but there were many reasons why the dominant class in a state like South Carolina should keep firm hold upon its emotions. The traditions of the South, too, laid greater stress upon individualism and local autonomy; but the special needs of the period counteracted this tendency also among a large element who wanted most a stable régime and leaned toward constructive policy.

As in many other cases in American history, the first phase in South Carolina party development in the Federalist period was the rise of local factions differing over local issues. Each of these provided itself with more or less definite party machinery, and attracted to its membership the persons of appropriate economic interests, social affiliations and personal points of view. Finally each of the local parties sought alliance with parties in other states in the Union, with a view to exerting influence upon the common federal government.

A beginning of the Federalist frame of mind may be seen as early as the movement of revolt from Great Britain. This movement in South Carolina was controlled by the aristocracy, and had little concern with the doctrine of natural rights. It was merely a demand for home-rule, with few appeals to theory of any sort. It was, furthermore, a movement for home-rule in Anglo-America as a whole, and not for the independence of the separate commonwealth of South Carolina. As an illustration of this, Christopher Gadsden, whose work of leadership in South Carolina corresponds to that of Samuel Adams in Massachusetts, wrote as early as 1765, "There ought to be no New England men, no New Yorkers, etc., known on the Continent, but all of us Americans."<sup>2</sup> Gadsden, furthermore, was so conspicuously aristocratic in his general attitude that he was charged by a leading Democrat in 1783 with having originated "nabobism" in Charleston.<sup>3</sup> As might be expected accordingly, the experience of this commonwealth during the whole

<sup>2</sup>Letter of Christopher Gadsden, Charleston, December 2, 1765, to Charles Garth, agent of the colony of South Carolina at London. R. W. Gibbs, *Documentary History of the American Revolution, chiefly in South Carolina, 1764-1776*, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Letter of Alexander Gillon, *South Carolina Gazette*, September 9, 1783.

revolutionary period failed to emphasize either democratic theory or state-rights doctrine<sup>4</sup> as much as did the agitations in numerous other states.

The divergence of parties upon local issues began during the war, if not before. The stress of the war times was extremely severe. The capture of Savannah in 1778 and of Charleston at the beginning of 1780 enabled the British forces to overrun the whole countryside and lay waste large tracts as far distant as the middle of the Piedmont region. Some of the inhabitants opposed the invaders by enlisting in the Continental army, and some by serving in partisan bands under Marion, Pickens and Sumter. Others came out openly as loyalists, giving aid to the British. Finally, a number of well-to-do citizens of the Charleston district, after experiencing for some months the distresses of invasive war, discouraged at the gloomy local prospects, and believing now that the country was grasping at the shadow of liberty and losing the substance of prosperity and happiness,<sup>5</sup> ceased their more or less active assistance to the "patriot" cause, accepted protection from General Cornwallis, and assumed neutral status.<sup>6</sup> In January, 1782, the state legislature in its session at Jacksonborough, while the British still held Charleston, passed acts confiscating the property of loyalists and amercing a number of citizens listed as having accepted British protection and having deserted the American cause. This led to much subsequent controversy.<sup>7</sup>

At the close of the war, the country lay devastated, the field-gangs and equipment of plantations were depleted, markets impaired, and the British bounty lost which had sustained the indigo industry. Worse than all this, the body politic was torn by factional

<sup>4</sup> W. H. Drayton, it is true, in 1778 denounced the Articles of Confederation, then before the state for ratification, on the ground that they would strip the several states of powers with which they could not safely part and would create a central government of enormous and dreadful powers. Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, pp. 98-115; Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution*, I, 491, 493. But this fantastic apprehension held by Drayton shortly before his death seems to have been sporadic and to have made no lasting impression unless upon a few men like Rawlins Lowndes, mentioned below.

<sup>5</sup> E. g., the case of Rawlins Lowndes as explained by Judge Pendleton in the *Charleston Evening Gazette*, October 27, 1785. See also, letter of Ralph Izard, April 27, 1784, to Thomas Jefferson, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, II, 194, 195.

<sup>6</sup> For treatment of this general theme, see McCrady, *History of South Carolina in the Revolution*, *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> For a belated statement of considerations operating *pro* and *contra* in the debates at Jacksonborough, see the discussion in the Assembly, February 21, 1787, reported in the *Charleston Morning Post*, February 22, 1787.

spirit, and the leaders of opinion, though somewhat dazed by the magnitude and complexity of the problems to be handled, began clamoring in support of a great diversity of policies.

The first issue was upon the treatment of loyalists and other obnoxious persons. Most of the substantial citizens favored such toleration for these as the British treaty required; but a group of radicals undertook, without the formality of law, to administer discipline to selected persons, and to drive them from the state. It was doubtful for a twelvemonth whether mob law or statute law would prevail. Judge LEdanus Burke in his charge to the grand jury at Charleston, June 9, 1783, expressed fears that the people, rendered boisterous by the war times, might turn against one another in factions. Four men, said he, had been killed in Charleston since the British army departed, and numerous others in the country. He deplored the retaliatory spirit, tending to beget feuds and factions, and he urged the grand jury to take steps to crush all violence.<sup>8</sup> In spite of this, a number of men gathered on the evening of July 10, whether as a mob or as an organized company, and "pumped" four or five persons whom they thought obnoxious to the state.<sup>9</sup> Next day a number of men of official status, principally members of the legislature, waited upon the governor and asked him to safeguard the good name of the city and state by suppressing this spirit of violence. The governor at once issued a proclamation denouncing the disorder, declaring that future breaches of the peace would be punished, and appealing to the judges, peace officers and all good citizens to aid in discouraging conduct of such alarming tendency.<sup>10</sup>

Order was restored by this measure; but the spirit of persecution still lived, to break out again in the following year. Meanwhile the men who most strongly cherished this hostility organized themselves as a force to be reckoned with. The prime mover in this appears to have been Alexander Gillon, a Charleston merchant who had been commissioned as commodore by the state of South Carolina in 1780 and sent abroad to obtain and operate a navy for the state. His achievement then was to hire a frigate from the Duke of Luxemburg, to equip it with a French crew, and send it out, after months of delay, to prey upon the British merchant marine. This frigate was soon captured by the British navy, and its cost added a very large item to South Carolina's Revolutionary debt.

<sup>8</sup> *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, June 10, 1783.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, July 12, 1783.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

Gillon saw no maritime service, but remained a titular commodore. His principal colleague in the leadership of the Charleston radicals was Dr. James Fallon. Their followers appear to have been mostly of the city's unpropertied class.

There was at this time a club in Charleston named the Smoking Society, of a convivial character, or as said by its critics, bacchanalian. Gillon and Fallon had themselves made president and secretary respectively of this club, changed its name to the "Marine Anti-Britannic Society", and devoted it to the championship of radical causes in politics.<sup>11</sup> An indication of the strength of the faction which he headed lies in Gillon's election by the Privy Council to the lieutenant-governorship of the state, August 22, 1783,<sup>12</sup> just a month after the "pumping" episode. This action by the Council may have been due to its having a majority of radicals among its members, or perhaps as probably to the desire of the conservatives to pacify the radicals by placing their leader in a position of dignity but of harmlessness in the administration. That Fallon also was zealously active is shown by a letter in the *Georgia Gazette*, October 16, 1783, written by a Georgian signing himself "Mentor" and apologizing for his interference by saying, "I cannot be happy when a sister state is fomented by intestine broils". The writer warned the people of Charleston against Fallon as a demagogue and against the anarchy which mob action would bring: "The common people of Charleston, though liable to be misled, are still open to conviction. . . . Tell them", he urged upon the leading men of the city, "that the advantages resulting from the preservation of government are Freedom, Unanimity, Commerce, and National Reputation; point out to them that the damnable evils which eternally spring from the anarchy they have aimed at are Suspicion, Dissension, Poverty, Disgrace, and Dissolution".

One of the Charleston papers printed in September a memorial of citizens of Northumberland County, Virginia, urging conservatism in public policy, liberal treatment towards foreigners, the refraining by public officers from the abuse of their powers, and the general toning up of political morality and manners.<sup>13</sup> Aside from

<sup>11</sup> Announcement of the annual dinner of the society to commemorate the evacuation of Charleston by the British on December 14, 1842. *Gazette of the State of South Carolina*, November 27, 1783. Letter signed "Another Patriot", *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, May 8 to 11, 1784.

<sup>12</sup> *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, August 23, 1783.

<sup>13</sup> Memorial by 69 inhabitants of Northumberland County to their delegates in the Virginia Assembly, June 10, 1783. *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, September 16 to 20, 1783.



this, little argument for conservatism appeared in the Charleston press during the autumn of 1783. The radicals were more active, but the quarrel died down in winter, to flare up again in the spring. Ralph Izard wrote Thomas Jefferson from his plantation near Charleston, April 27, 1784: "Would to God I could say that tranquility was perfectly restored in this State. Dissensions and factions still exist, and like the Hydra, when one head is destroyed, another arises."<sup>14</sup>

At this time the dissension was in full blast again; and the issue was more clear-cut than before. Each faction had acquired one of the daily newspapers as its organ. In the early spring the Marine Anti-Britannic Society adopted resolutions, described by its opponents as ridiculous and pompous jargon, and requested each of the gazettes of the city to publish them. Mrs. Timothy, who owned the *Gazette of the State of South Carolina*, gave them due publication; but John Miller, publisher of the *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, who was also state printer, "in terms very preemptory and disrespectful, refused to give any place in his gazette to the society's resolutions, evidencing thereby, as well as by some former acts of his toward the said Society, that his Press is not thoroughly uninfluenced and free". The society therefore resolved unanimously to boycott Miller's journal as regarded both subscriptions and advertisements.<sup>15</sup>

The Anti-Britannics now resorted to an attempt at terrorism. About the middle of April they posted handbills in Charleston listing eleven persons, either loyalists or recent immigrants, and giving them notice to quit the state within ten days. About the same time they or their allies did violence to the person of a Mr. Rees in the interior of the state; and Mrs. Timothy's paper published reports, apparently false, of similar lynch-law punishments inflicted upon other persons. In denouncing these proceedings, a citizen writing under the anonym "Another Patriot", in the *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, April 28, expressed the hope that persons about to sail from Charleston for Europe would not take the handbills too seriously nor spread lurid reports of them abroad, to add to the damage done the state by the reports of the "pumping match" of the previous year. He assured them that an association of the good citizens was being formed, resolutely determined to

<sup>14</sup> *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, II, 104.

<sup>15</sup> Preamble and resolutions printed in the *Gazette of the State of South Carolina*, April 8, 1784.

uphold the magistracy and to put it out of the power of malcontents to disturb the peace of the city.

The city council resolved on April 30 that in order to secure the suppression of any riots which might occur, the bell of St. Michael's church should be rung in case of turbulence, whereupon the intendant and wardens should at once repair to the state-house; and it commanded that all magistrates and constables, with their emblems of office, and all regular and peaceable citizens should rally likewise at the state-house and "invigorate the arm of Government".<sup>16</sup> This riot ordinance seems to have turned the tide against the Anti-Britannics. The writer "Another Patriot" declared in Miller's paper of May 11, that most of those who had been followers of Gillon and Fallon had joined the society in the belief, fostered by its officers, that it would advantage them in their trades; but that these had at length seen through the cheat, and that at a recent meeting only thirty-nine members could be assembled out of the six hundred of which the society's hand-bills had boasted.<sup>17</sup> This exposure was shortly followed by ridicule. A citizen calling himself "A Steady and Open Republican", in a long article denouncing Fallon, turned upon the society:<sup>18</sup>

Carolina, that has not twenty of her natives at sea, immediately to set up an Anti-Britannic Marine Society! Laughable indeed! If intended to raise a Navy, that is expressly contrary to the Confederation, and I confess the very thought of such a thing gives me the gripes, before we recover from the endless expences and embarrassments of the wretched bargain made for us only in the *bare hire* of one single Frigate.

Several anonymous radicals replied,<sup>19</sup> and a running controversy was kept up in the gazettes from May to September. There was apparently for some years no further attempt at mob action;<sup>20</sup> the radicals turned their attention instead to getting control of the government through polling majorities in the elections. Of this and the outcome, John Lloyd wrote from Charleston, December 7, 1784, to his nephew, T. B. Smith:<sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> *South Carolina Gazette and General Advertiser*, May 1, 1784.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, May 11, 1784.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, May 13, 1784.

<sup>19</sup> One of these was driven to reveal himself as William Hornby.

<sup>20</sup> E. g., M. Petrie wrote from Charleston, May 18, 1792, to Gabriel Manigault, Goose Creek, S. C.: "M. de Kereado has taken passage in Garman, just arrived. He is very right to leave this town, full of discord. Threatenings of raising the mob against some lately arrived have succeeded to the *impuissance* of raising or getting the Law against them." MS. in possession of Mrs. Hawkins Jenkins, Pinopolis, S. C.

<sup>21</sup> MS. in the Charleston Library.

The malecontented party having by several publications endeavoured to influence the electors throughout the State to make choice of men to represent them in the General Assembly, from the lower class: the gentlemen of property, to preserve their necessary consequence in the community and in order to prevent anarchy and confusion, have almost unanimously exerted themselves in opposition to them, and it is with particular pleasure I inform you they have pretty generally carried their point, especially in this city, so that we shall have exceedingly good representation, and by that means support the honor and credit of the country.

Antagonism to the aristocracy, however, was strong, particularly in the upland districts, where the cotton industry did not yet exist and a small-farming régime prevailed. Izard wrote to Jefferson, June 10, 1785: "Our governments tend too much to Democracy. A handicraftsman thinks an apprenticeship necessary to make him acquainted with his business. But our back countrymen are of opinion that a politician may be born such, as well as a poet."<sup>22</sup>

The governor gave notice on March 17, 1785, that all persons who had been exiled from sister states and had taken refuge in South Carolina must leave the state within one month from the date of this notice; and that all persons who had been banished from South Carolina and had returned thither under the provisions of the British treaty, might remain in the state for three months longer than the treaty stipulated, but must depart immediately at the end of that period.<sup>23</sup> This action by the executive put an end to the anti-loyalist agitation; but the parties already in process of evolution continued to develop and to oppose one another upon successive new issues.

The prevalence of acute hard times, reaching extreme severity in 1785 and 1786, turned public attention sharply to questions of industry, commerce and finance. A narrative of economic developments in the state following the close of the British war was related by Judge Henry Pendleton in his charges to the grand juries of Georgetown, Cheraws and Camden Districts, in the autumn of 1786, in part as follows:<sup>24</sup>

No sooner had we recovered and restored the country to peace and order than a rage for running into debt became epidemical; instead of resorting to patient industry, and by slow and cautious advances, recovering to the state that opulence and vigor which the devastations

<sup>22</sup> *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, II, 197.

<sup>23</sup> *Gazette of the State of South Carolina*, March 21, 1785.

<sup>24</sup> *Charleston Morning Post*, December 13, 1786. Practically the same narrative is given as a preface to an argument for the repeal of the "stay laws", in a letter signed "Appius", addressed to the General Assembly, and printed in the *Charleston Morning Post*, February 15 and 16, 1787.

of a long and calamitous war had destroyed, individuals were for getting rich by a *coup de main*, a good bargain—a happy speculation was almost every man's object and pursuit. Instead of a rigid economy, which the distress of the times so strongly excited, what a load of debt was in a short time contracted in the purchase of British superfluities, and of lands and slaves for which no price was too high, if credit for the purchase was to be obtained; these fatal effects too were accelerated by the very indulgence and lenity which afforded the happiest opportunity to those in debt to surmount all their difficulties—I mean the act for prescribing the payment of old debts by instalments of one, two and three years; had this act totally abolished all old debts, men could not with more avidity have run on contracting new ones. How small a pittance of the produce of the years 1783, 4 and 5, altho' amounting to upwards of 400,000 l. sterling a year, on an average, hath been applied toward lessening old burdens? Hence it was that men not compelled by law to part with the produce of these years, for the payment of their debts, employed it to gain a further credit in new purchases to several times the amount, and thereby forced an exportation of it to foreign parts, at a price which the markets of consumption would not bear—what then was the consequence?—the merchants were driven to the exportation of gold and silver, which so rapidly followed, and with it fled the vital spirit of the government:—a diminution of the value of the capital, as well as the annual produce of estates, in consequence of the fallen price,—the loss of public credit, and the most alarming deficiencies in the revenue, and in the collection of the taxes; the recovery of new debts, as well as old in effect suspended, while the numerous bankruptcies which have happened in Europe, amongst the merchants trading to America, the reproach of which is cast upon us, have proclaimed to all the trading nations to guard against our laws and policy, and even against our moral principles.

The governor's message to the general assembly on September 26, 1785, called attention to the calamitous state of affairs existing: money scarce, men unable to pay their debts, and citizens liable to fall prey to aliens. The House at once appointed a committee of fifteen members on the state of the republic. In the open debate which this large committee held on September 28, several remedies for the shortage of money were proposed: one by Ralph Izard on behalf of conservatives, that the importation of negro slaves be prohibited for three years and the community thereby saved from the constant drain of capital which it was suffering; others by radical representatives for the more obvious but more short-sighted recourse to stay-laws and paper money.<sup>25</sup> The assembly at this session adopted the proposal of paper money, and authorized its issue to the amount of £100,000, to be loaned to citizens, on security, for five years at seven per cent.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Charleston Evening Gazette*, September 26 and 28, 1785.

<sup>26</sup> Act of October 12, 1785, in Cooper and McCord, *S. C. Statutes at Large*, IV. 712-716.

Next spring, the depression had grown even more severe. Many Charleston merchants had gone out of business and the rent of shops had fallen one-third.<sup>27</sup> Commodore Gillon, a member for Charleston, proposed in February, 1786, a stay-law, granting debtors three years in which to meet obligations, and exempting them from sheriffs' sales meanwhile. After long debate this bill passed the House, but it was apparently defeated in the Senate. In December Gillon stood for re-election, and was returned as twenty-eighth in the list of thirty representatives from the Charleston parishes.<sup>28</sup> In February, 1787, Gillon reintroduced his bill for a stay-law, and gave warning that if it were not enacted, something more radical might be expected. Dr. Ramsay, in opposition, denied the right of the legislature to interfere in private contracts, and said that the experiments which South Carolina had already made in stay-laws had shown that they promoted irresponsibility and did no substantial good. He declined to believe that the people would become tumultuous if the bill should fail to pass. Mr. John Julius Pringle, Speaker of the House, advocated the bill, stating that the voice of the people was so strenuous in its favor that it would not be sound policy to reject it. The bill passed the committee of the whole house by a large majority,<sup>29</sup> and was enacted. Other debates on phases of the same question occurred in 1788, which further widened the rift between conservatives and radicals.<sup>30</sup>

The industrial depression continued for several years longer, until in the middle nineties the development of the cotton industry, beginning with the introduction of the sea-island variety in 1786 in Georgia and two or three years later in South Carolina, and hastened and immensely enlarged in its possibilities by Whitney's invention of the short-staple gin, in 1793, brought a renewal of general prosperity. To illustrate the situation of numerous planters during the hard times, a letter is extant from Joseph Bee to a creditor, October 19, 1786:<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Letter of John Lloyd, then president of the Senate of South Carolina, to T. B. Smith, April 15, 1786. MS. in the Charleston Library.

<sup>28</sup> His vote was 203, as against 426 for David Ramsay and Edward Rutledge, at the head of the poll, 422 for C. C. Pinckney, 413 for Thomas Pinckney, and similar votes for other conservative gentry. *Charleston Morning Post*, December 5, 1786.

<sup>29</sup> *Charleston Morning Post*, February 19, 1787. Act of March 28, 1787, in Cooper and McCord, *Statutes at Large*, V. 36-38.

<sup>30</sup> Debates on this subject, in the autumn session of the legislature, may be found in the *Charleston City Gazette or Daily Advertiser*, October 23, 1788.

<sup>31</sup> MS. among the Gibbes papers, owned by the Gibbes family, Columbia, S. C.

It has been my misfortune, among several hundreds to have been sued and even to have had Judgements obtained against me, in consequence of which I find the sheriff has a very valuable plantation of mine to be sold, which I at sundry times endeavoured to do, both at Public and Private Sale in order to satisfy my Creditors, but all my endeavour proved fruitless, therefore it would be needless for me in such a case to ask a Friend the favour, as I might naturally expect a Denial, therefore I would just leave the matter to yourself to act in whatever way you think proper, tho at the same time I could most heartily wish that I could command money in order to close the matter, as it gives me pain to be dunned at any time. . . .

Bee finally announced in the public prints, June, 1784, that having been reduced to poverty through the sale of his real estate by the sheriff for a thirteenth part of what he might formerly have had for it at private sale, he was now prepared to go to jail to convince his creditors—after which he hoped to be left in some peace of mind.

The assembly in 1791 provided for the gradual calling in of the loans made to the citizens under the act of 1785 and for the retirement of the paper money.<sup>32</sup> But in the following years measures occasionally prevailed for delaying the redemption; and there was almost constantly a dread among the conservatives that the radicals might again get the upper hand and, if unchecked by state or federal constitutions, do great mischief to the commonwealth.

Local concerns, however, were overshadowed after 1787 by problems directly connected with federal relations and policy, while in some cases, such as those of paper money, tariff and public debt, the former local problems were quickly handed over to the central government. It was quite natural under the circumstances, that the political factions which had grown into existence while the state government was managing nearly all of the public business should continue in life, and, after a brief period of transition and partial reorganization, should transfer the general application of their points of view and predilections to the affairs of the federal government.

The need of more efficient central control in the United States had been felt by the Carolina planters immediately upon the ending of the British war. An expression of this, for example, was a pamphlet attributed with probable justice to Christopher Gadsden.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Act of February 19, 1791, in Cooper and McCord, *Statutes at Large*, V, 166-167.

<sup>33</sup> *Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution*. . . . The lower half of the title-page of the copy in the Charleston Library is torn off and missing. The pamphlet was apparently written in 1783 or 1784.

The author of this expressed gratification at the successful close of the American revolt, and urged the advisability of preserving peace. To this end he thought firm government necessary, and especially sound policy in finance.<sup>34</sup> Congress, he said, must be trusted with the power of securing supplies for the expenses of the Confederation and the power of contracting debts, and "this power must not be capable of being defeated by the opposition of any minority in the States"; everything depends upon the preservation of a firm political union, "and such a union cannot be preserved without giving all possible weight and energy to the authority of that delegation which constitutes the Union". In conclusion, to drive home his contention, he pictured the consequences to be expected if the policy were not adopted. He lamented the rise of clashing interests,<sup>35</sup> and foreboded that in the absence of any strong central control these would break the union, and in that event the whole work of the Revolution would miscarry, the movement for liberty in all future efforts would be discouraged, and the present epoch would but open a new scene of human degeneracy and wretchedness.

In 1784 the Charleston newspapers from time to time advocated strengthening the Union, on general principles, and in 1785 they regretted New York's veto of the plan to empower Congress to levy import duties. Concrete local developments promoted nationalism especially among the planters. To improve their method of rice culture they were abandoning the earlier system of irrigating their fields from reservoirs of rain-water, and were clearing and embanking great tracts of river swamps which could be flooded and drained at will through the rise and fall of the tide.<sup>36</sup> For this work they needed large supplies of capital on loan and they were embarrassed by its dearth. The financial crisis of 1785 forced the planters, and the merchants also, to face the situation squarely and to realize that the achievement of political independence by the United States had not made South Carolina financially self-sufficient. It made them see that economically their commonwealth was still in a colonial condition, in need of steady backing by some strong financial power. England was no longer available; but they saw that the Northern commercial states could be made a substitute. At the same time it was seen that a political alliance with the Northern conservative interests would partly safeguard the Carolina conservatives from injury in case the radicals should locally get

<sup>34</sup> *Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution*, p. 18.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Mrs. St. Julien Ravenel, *Life and Times of William Lowndes*, pp. 22, 23.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIV.—35.

into control. On the whole in this period the conservatives of the Charleston district appear to have dreaded the rule of their local opponents as the worst of threatening evils, and to have welcomed the restriction of the state's functions in large part because it would reduce the scope of the possible damage to be wrought by the radicals in their midst in case they should capture the state machinery. For a number of years, therefore, most of the leading planters on the coast, and many of the merchants, not only favored the remodelling of the central government as accomplished in 1787-1789, but favored also the exercise of broad powers by Congress under the Constitution.

In the years 1786-1788, even the radicals of the Charleston district largely approved the strengthening of the Union, partly perhaps because they saw that commerce depended upon efficient government, and partly because some of their leaders, notably the brilliant young Charles Pinckney,<sup>37</sup> had ambition for careers in national affairs. The South Carolina delegates in the Federal Convention, all of whom were from the Charleston vicinity, all favored the new Constitution; nearly all of the lowland members of the state legislature in 1788 voted for the call of a state convention with power to ratify it; and in that convention the delegation from Charleston voted solidly *aye* upon the motion to ratify. For the time, therefore, at least upon the question of federal relations, the Charleston factions were largely at peace. Commodore Gillon, for example, in the debate in the House of Representatives found himself an ally of C. C. Pinckney and David Ramsay.<sup>38</sup>

The opposition to the federal plan of 1787 came from the distant interior of the state, but as its chief spokesman found one of the aristocratic conservatives of the coast, in the person of Rawlins Lowndes. The uplanders had had experience within the state of living under a government which, by reason of their having a minority in the legislature, they could not control; and they dreaded a similar arrangement in the federal system. Lowndes, also, was impressed with the prospective danger that a coalition of northern interests might use the federal machinery for the oppression of South Carolina with her peculiar needs; and he pleaded with his fellow slaveholding planters to adopt his view, but without success.

<sup>37</sup> Not to be confused with General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who like his brother Thomas was a conservative and a Federalist. To distinguish him from his cousin Charles Cotesworth, Charles Pinckney was nicknamed "Black-guard Charlie" by the conservatives.

<sup>38</sup> J. Elliot, *Debates*, third ("second") ed., IV. 253-317.



Lowndes was not even elected to the state convention. In his absence Patrick Dollard from the interior was the sole spokesman of the opposition to the ordinance. He said:<sup>39</sup>

My constituents are highly alarmed at the large and rapid strides which this new government has taken towards despotism. They say it is big with political mischiefs and pregnant with a greater variety of impending woes to the good people of the Southern States, especially South Carolina, than all the plagues supposed to issue from the box of Pandora. They say it is particularly calculated for the meridian of despotic aristocracy; that it evidently tends to promote the ambitious views of a few able and designing men, and enslave the rest.

The coast delegates were solidly deaf to this declaration, as they had been to Lowndes's arguments, though some of them, patricians and plebeians, were destined after a short experience under the new government to reverse their position and champion the doctrines which they now rejected.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

<sup>39</sup> Elliot, *Debates*, IV. 336-338.



## THE SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERALISTS, II.

THE scene of chief interest in the political history of South Carolina now shifts to the federal Congress—to the debates upon the initial policies of the government, and their influence upon the sentiment of the members and the public. The senators from South Carolina during the first sessions were Ralph Izard and Pierce Butler, who accorded in their policies for a year or two, but then drifted apart. Butler was impetuous in disposition, and likely to denounce all persons, the administration included, who opposed his views. Izard was somewhat more magisterial in temperament. Butler had acted with the conservatives in 1783-1784, and had supported the new federal Constitution in 1787-1788. But a brief experience in Congress brought the beginning of a thorough change in his attitude. On August 11, 1789, he wrote from New York to James Iredell of North Carolina, who had been a close friend:<sup>1</sup>

I find locality and partiality reign as much in our Supreme Legislature as they could in a county court or State Legislature. . . . I came here full of hopes that the greatest liberality would be exercised; that the consideration of the *whole*, and the general good would take place of every object; but here I find men scrambling for partial advantages, State interests, and in short a train of those narrow, impolitic measures that must after a while shake the Union to its very foundation. . . . I confess I wish you [*i. e.*, the state of North Carolina] to come into the confederacy as the only chance the Southern interest has to preserve a balance of power.

William Maclay, the caustic senator from Pennsylvania, observes in his *Journal* that Butler was himself the personification of sectionalism, bent upon the selfsame narrow policy for local advantage which he censured so flamingly in others.<sup>2</sup> The development of Butler's general attitude, it may be remarked, was closely paralleled in the case of all the leading Georgia politicians of the period,<sup>3</sup> while Izard's policies were those of almost the whole group of South Carolina conservatives.

After Butler through denouncing the tariff and tonnage bills

<sup>1</sup> G. J. McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, II. 264, 265. For other letters of Butler to Iredell, see *ibid.*, II. 44, 87, 403 and 406.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of William Maclay*, edited by E. S. Maclay, pp. 71, 72 *et passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. U. B. Phillips, "Georgia and State Rights", in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1901, II. 26 *et passim*.

had drifted into the opposition, Izard's chief working associate in Congress was his son-in-law William Smith,<sup>4</sup> a representative from South Carolina for nearly a decade in the Lower House. These two, aided vigorously after 1794 by Robert Goodloe Harper, were apparently the chief agents in holding the South Carolina conservatives firmly to the nationalistic policies and to the Federalist party alignment.

The chief issue in the First Congress promoting the doctrine of broad construction on the part of the South Carolinians was that of the assumption of state debts. South Carolina, together with Massachusetts and Connecticut, was laboring under a heavy debt<sup>5</sup> incurred during the war and still undischarged. The desire to have this assumed by the central government was a federalizing influence in the state. William Smith, furthermore, bought up a quantity of state notes, and passed the word around among his Charleston friends that there was probably money to be made by all who would enter the speculation.<sup>6</sup> This of course increased the enthusiasm with which "assumption" was locally favored.

There was little discussion in the state, it seems, over the first two presidential elections. George Washington was the obvious choice for the presidency, and South Carolina gave him her eight electoral votes in each case. At the first election she gave her remaining eight votes to John Rutledge, a citizen of her own whom she was delighted to honor; and in 1792 her electors cast seven votes for Adams and one for Burr. George Clinton, the regular Republican vice-presidential candidate at the time, was little known in the state; and the Republican party had not yet acquired firm organization.<sup>7</sup>

In 1792 affairs in France reached a crisis in their course which caused the Revolutionary government there to declare war against all the neighboring monarchs of Europe and to proclaim a world-wide crusade to establish its doctrines of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. This propaganda was promptly extended to the United States, and Citizen Genet, its chief emissary, began his work in the

<sup>4</sup> Sometimes called by his full name, William Loughton Smith, but signing himself apparently always without the middle name.

<sup>5</sup> Some four million dollars in the case of South Carolina.

<sup>6</sup> Letter of David Campbell, a relative of Smith, to the editor, in the *Charleston City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, October 3, 1794. The period was one of much speculation throughout the country.

<sup>7</sup> The narrative of the Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian party origins, written from the Federalist point of view, was published in a pamphlet preserved in the William Smith collection in the Charleston Library and attributed to William Smith. It is entitled *The Politics and Views of a Certain Party* (1792).

city of Charleston in April, 1793. Some of the local radicals, as we have seen, had already been disposed to be hostile toward Great Britain, and to adopt populist policies in domestic affairs. The French agitation now greatly strengthened these tendencies. The enthusiasm for France and Democracy was for a time very great. Two societies, the "Republican" and the "French Patriotic", were promptly formed at Charleston, and like the many similar organizations at the time in the other cities and towns of the United States, drank multitudinous toasts with great acclaim to liberty and equal rights and to the perpetual friendship of France and America.<sup>9</sup> Many of the young men particularly were captivated by the enthusiasm; and the military and naval commissions offered by Genet were eagerly accepted by adventurous characters among the citizens.<sup>9</sup>

But there were those who welcomed neither Genet nor the ideas which he represented; and the ardor even of many of the enthusiasts was soon chilled by President Washington's disapproval of Genet's deeds. In some cases, that of Robert Goodloe Harper for example, the reaction was so strong as to carry young men all the way from rampant democracy to fast conservatism and steady membership in the Federalist party.<sup>10</sup> By the end of 1793 the people of South Carolina were in well-defined Francophile and Francophobe factions.<sup>11</sup> The conservatives had control of the South Carolina house of representatives. On December 2, 1793, that house resolved, unanimously, that a committee be appointed with full powers to send for persons and papers and ascertain the truth of a report that an armed force was levying in the state by persons under foreign

<sup>9</sup> E. g., *S. C. State Gazette*, September 22, 1793; *Charleston City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, February 9, 1795; *American Daily Advertiser* (Philadelphia), July 31 and September 4, 1793.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. "The Mangourit Correspondence in Respect to Genet's Projected Attack upon the Floridas, 1793-1794", in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1897, pp. 569-679; and "Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797", *id.* for 1903, vol. II., both edited by F. J. Turner.

<sup>10</sup> In a debate in Congress, March 29, 1798, W. B. Giles taunted Harper with having declaimed with fervor in 1792 and 1793, in favor of the Rights of Man. Harper replied at once: "He owned he partook of that enthusiasm which at the time raged in America; because he was deceived. He then believed the French had been unjustly attacked but he now found they were the first assailants. . . . He then believed that the principal actors in the [French Revolution] were virtuous patriots, but he had since discovered that they were a set of worthless scoundrels and mad-headed enthusiasts, who in endeavoring to reduce their fallacious schemes to practice, have introduced more calamities into the world than ages of government will be able to cure." *Charleston City Gazette*, April 19, 1798.

<sup>11</sup> A similar state of affairs prevailed in Savannah, as witness conflicting resolutions adopted in public meetings and reported in the *Georgia Journal and Independent Federal Register*, January 11 and 15, 1794.

authority. On December 3, Robert Anderson, chairman of this committee, directed Colonel Wade Hampton to summon William Tate, Stephen Drayton, John Hambleton, Jacob R. Brown, Robert Tate and Richard Speake, to appear before the committee at once, using compulsion, if necessary, to bring them, and to search for papers relating to their recited purpose. In accordance with orders Hampton seized Stephen Drayton and carried him 130 miles to make appearance at Columbia. Drayton then employed Alexander Moultrie as attorney to sue the members of the committee for \$6000 damages. The house resolved that members were not suable for actions taken in the house, and it summoned both Drayton and Moultrie to appear and receive reprimand for violating the rights of the house. These men refused to appear, and Moultrie in protest against the proceedings published a pamphlet giving the whole narrative from his point of view.<sup>12</sup>

Another *contrectemps* is related in a public letter addressed by M. Carey to his brother *vrais sans culottes*, and published in the *South Carolina Gazette*, July 26, 1794. Upon the arrival of the vessel of the Republic *L'Amie de la Liberté* at Charleston after a cruise in neighboring waters, her officers and crew learned that Colonel Jacob Read had called them in open court a lawless band of pirates. Carey then accosted Read at the door of the State House and demanded his reason for such accusation. Read replied that he did not consider himself bound to answer for his language in court to unknown and insignificant characters. Carey then called Read a liar and a scoundrel and gave him his address; but next day Read filed a complaint against him and Carey was bound over to keep the peace. Read now took offense at the *Gazette* for publishing Carey's letter and challenged one of its editors, Timothy, to a duel; but the affray was prevented by an officer of the law.

In Charleston and the plantation districts the coolness toward democratic theory and the reaction against it were promoted by the news from the French West Indies. In Hayti particularly, the application of the doctrine of inherent liberty and equality to the negro population had led to an overwhelming revolt of the blacks under Toussaint L'Ouverture, and had brought great disaster to the whites. Haytian refugees flocked into Charleston, as well as into New Orleans, Norfolk, Philadelphia and New York, furnishing whether audibly or silently an argument for firm government. A view which prevailed throughout the decade was expressed by Na-

<sup>12</sup> *An Appeal to the People, on the Conduct of a certain Public Body in South Carolina respecting Col. Drayton and Col. Moultrie*, by Alexander Moultrie (Charleston, 1794).

thaniel Russell, writing from Charleston, June 6, 1794, to Ralph Izard at Philadelphia:<sup>13</sup>

We are to have a meeting of the citizens on the 11th inst when I hope some effective measure will be adopted to prevent any evil consequences from that diabolical decree of the national convention which emancipates all the slaves in the french colonies, a circumstance the most alarming that could happen to this country.

Another consideration against thoroughgoing democracy in the state was that it would lead to a redistribution of representation<sup>14</sup> in the legislature in such a way that the up-country would acquire control of both houses and be able to enact legislation of any sort it desired, regardless of the opposition of the plantation interests which at this time and for a few years longer were still confined to the coast. The Jeffersonian movement, however, combining the principles of individual rights and state rights, welcomed from the beginning by the Charleston radicals, and vigorously organized by Charles Pinckney with Pierce Butler, Thomas Sumter and Wade Hampton as his colleagues, had strength enough even in the lowlands to keep the Federalists in fear of losing all their Congressional representation at each recurring election.<sup>15</sup>

The theme which furnished the most active partizan discussions in 1794-1795 was of course the Jay Treaty. William Smith addressed his constituents in a pamphlet in the spring of 1794 to vindicate his conduct in Congress from the slander of his opponents. He repelled the charge of advocating the cause of Great Britain or vindicating her piratical conduct, but he said that on the other hand he had been no more friendly toward France, for the French government had been no more friendly toward us. He said that he leaned toward Great Britain in the matter of commercial relations for the reason that friendly connection with British trade was vastly the more important to the United States and especially to South Carolina.<sup>16</sup> Smith mentioned the news of the Jay Treaty in a postscript to his pamphlet, but gave it no full discussion. The popular

<sup>13</sup> MS. among the Ralph Izard papers in the possession of Mrs. Hawkins Jenkins, Pinopolis, S. C.

<sup>14</sup> On this general theme see W. A. Schaper, "Sectionalism in South Carolina", in the *Annual Report of the Amer. Hist. Assoc.* for 1900.

<sup>15</sup> E. g., anonymous letter to the editor, *Charleston City Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, October 10, 1794, supporting William Smith for re-election, and conveying "an electioneering whisper" to the partizans of the old representation, the funded interest and the system of energy and power. The plan he proposes is for the Smith supporters to keep the opposition divided as it now is between several ambitious Republicans and win by casting a plurality of votes.

<sup>16</sup> *An Address from William Smith to his Constituents* (Philadelphia, 1794).

debate in South Carolina upon the treaty was reviewed in part by Harper in a letter to his constituents in 1796. The *Charleston City Gazette*, July 14, 1795, had declared the treaty "degrading to the National honor, dangerous to the political existence and destructive to the agricultural, commercial and shipping interests of the people of the United States". Chief Justice Rutledge in a speech printed in the *City Gazette* of July 17 had described the treaty as "prostituting the dearest rights of freemen and laying them at the feet of royalty". Charles Pinckney in a speech at Charleston had accused Jay of corruption by the British court and of having bartered away the western territory. Harper pointed out the intemperance of these censures, and proceeded in quiet and solid argument to defend the ratification of the treaty.<sup>17</sup>

Up to this time the two parties had not reached full organization and had not decisively divided all the South Carolina voters between them. For example, Henry W. De Saussure and John Rutledge, jr., both talented popular young men and active in state politics, were not attached to either party. Rutledge, in fact, was elected to Congress by the people of Orangeburg and Beaufort districts in 1796 as an uncommitted candidate, and he did not cast his lot with the Federalists until some weeks after he had taken his seat.

In the presidential campaign of 1796 the issue was known to be extremely doubtful, and each side strained every resource for victory. In South Carolina the Federalists had been made uneasy by losses in recent Congressional and assembly elections. To improve the prospects in the state and possibly in neighboring states as well, the party in the nation at large adopted Major Thomas Pinckney as its vice-presidential candidate. Pinckney belonged to an old and prominent rice-planting family, had served with credit in the war, had been governor of the state, and had recently won distinction and praise in the whole country as the negotiator of a very popular treaty with Spain.<sup>18</sup> He was in a word an honored member of a much honored conservative group of "revolutionary warriors and statesmen". He was not an outright party man, but his general point of view was harmonious with that of the Federalists. Alexander Hamilton, in fact, tried to secure his election over Adams's head. With Pinckney on the ticket the party managers in South Carolina, Izard, Smith and Harper, hoped to get at least a few of

<sup>17</sup> *An Address from Robert Goodloe Harper, of South Carolina, to his Constituents, containing his Reasons for approving the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation with Great Britain* (Boston, 1796).

<sup>18</sup> Rev. C. C. Pinckney, *Life of General Thomas Pinckney* (Boston, 1895).



the electoral votes of the state for Adams;<sup>19</sup> and Smith urged Izard to visit the legislature and work to this end.

The local supporters of Adams feared mainly the influence of Edward Rutledge, and the outcome justified their fear. Rutledge was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and had seen some military service; but after the war for many years he would accept no public appointment, except a seat in the state legislature which he held from 1782 to 1798. He rendered frequent unofficial service as peace-maker in preventing duels and in other private and public matters.<sup>20</sup> In a word he was another highly esteemed member of the Revolutionary group, and was the Nestor of the legislature. He was the intimate friend of Thomas Pinckney, but was probably a little more democratic in his point of view. For example, he had framed the act which in 1791 had abolished primogeniture in South Carolina.<sup>21</sup> Rutledge preferred Jefferson to Adams in 1796, and probably had hopes, like Hamilton, of bringing in Pinckney over both of them. The legislature and the electors willingly adopted the Pinckney-Jefferson plan, and the votes of South Carolina were cast eight for Pinckney and eight for Jefferson. A number of New England Federalist electors, on the other hand, "scratched" Pinckney and reduced his total vote below that of either Adams or Jefferson. The votes cast by South Carolina would have given Jefferson the presidency had not North Carolina and Virginia each given a single unexpected vote to Adams.

In 1797 Ralph Izard, already in retirement from the Senate, was made permanently an invalid by paralysis, and William Smith, probably unable to control his district longer, withdrew from Congress and took the mission to Portugal. The Federalist management in the state passed entirely to Robert Goodloe Harper, who differed greatly from the local Federalist type both in origin and in residence though not in policy. He was a native of Virginia who after graduating at Princeton had gone to Charleston to study law and seek a career. Admitted to the bar in 1786, he removed to the up-country where lawyers were few and opportunities many. He rapidly gained reputation as a lawyer, pamphleteer and politician, changed his politics from Democratic to Federalist as we have seen, in 1794-1795, and was from 1795 to 1801 by far the most alert, vigorous and effective spokesman and leader of the Federalists in

<sup>19</sup> On the South Carolina situation, see the letters of Smith to Izard, November 3 and 8, 1796, and of Harper to Izard, November 4, 1796, printed in this number of this journal.

<sup>20</sup> David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1809), II, 523.

<sup>21</sup> J. B. O'Neill, *Bench and Bar of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1850), II, 117.

the Lower South. De Saussure and Rutledge were later recruits, who wrought sturdily for the party in the later nineties.

General William A. Washington, John Ewing Calhoun and Dr. David Ramsay were active at times as Federalist leaders of secondary importance, and Gabriel Manigault, though always preferring plantation life to public office for himself, served steadily as a guiding party administrator at home while Smith and Harper were on the firing line in Congress. The brothers Charles Cotesworth and Thomas Pinckney were dignitaries within and ornaments to, rather than working members of, the local Federalist party. Christopher Gadsden, another prominent veteran, while sympathizing with his aristocratic associates, refused to countenance party action. He published a pamphlet in 1797 decrying the spirit of faction, objecting to the pledging of presidential electors in advance, and prophesying results from the rivalry of Jefferson and Adams similar to the violence between Caesar and Pompey of old.<sup>22</sup>

All of the Federalist leaders were members of the old planter families in the lowlands, except Harper who himself was recognized as of good Virginia stock. The Republicans, whether leaders or rank and file, were less homogeneous and, partly in consequence, were harder to keep in solid organization. The Charleston democracy, the poor-whites of the pine-flats and the sturdy yeomanry of the Piedmont furnished the chief components of the party's mass; but these classes were without the oratorical gift in which the gentry revelled and without experience in large affairs. They elected to Congress a few men of their own class,<sup>23</sup> the veteran Thomas Sumter, for example, but they secured aggressive leaders only through the enlistment of some of the planters in the Republican cause.

The career of Pierce Butler in this connection we have already noted. Another example is Wade Hampton, in many respects a younger prototype of Butler, a man of impetuous temper and highly individualistic inclinations, submitting to no party restraints. He usually opposed the Federalists, partly because he was a man of the new Piedmont planters and not of the old lowland gentry, and partly because of his wish to confine all government within narrow bounds.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> *A Few Observations on some late Public Transactions . . . By a Member of the Congress on the Stamp Act . . . and of the two first at Philadelphia, in 1774, and 1775* (Charleston, 1797).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Carolina Gazette*, September 13, 1798, letter to the editor, signed "A Resident of the Upper Districts".

<sup>24</sup> For an excellent first-hand character-sketch of Hampton see Edward Hooker's Diary, in the *Annual Report of the Am. Hist. Assoc.* for 1896, I. 845-850.

The chief organizer and manager of the Republican machinery was Charles Pinckney, cousin to the two Revolutionary veterans. He was a man with ability for constructive statesmanship, as was shown very early in his career by his excellent work in the Philadelphia Convention of 1787. He was, however, a plunger in business affairs,<sup>25</sup> and a spoilsman in party politics; and according to tradition in Charleston he was dishonest in the conduct of trust estates committed to his charge.<sup>26</sup> He launched into Republican leadership partly from a dislike of Adams, but more largely, it may be conjectured, from a desire for a conspicuous career. In 1795 the South Carolina Republicans were a leaderless party and Charles Pinckney was a talented politician without a following and with no principles in particular. He embraced the opportunity, was elected governor and senator, and in 1800 swung his state to Jefferson and deposed his enemy, Adams, from the presidency.

The course of foreign affairs in 1796, 1797 and 1798 gave the Federalists a decisive tactical advantage. Harper utilized the opportunity, according to his custom, and in August, 1798, addressed a pamphlet to his constituents. In it he described the offensive behavior of the French Republic toward the United States and told of the steps in progress for defending America against a French invasion, which he declared would probably be undertaken unless bold military preparations in this country should discourage it.<sup>27</sup>

Sentiment in Charleston had already grown so apprehensive of French attack upon the port that measures suitable to an emergency were being taken. At a mass meeting assembled in St. Michael's Church on May 5 to express public endorsement of Adams's foreign policy, a proposal was made and welcomed for a voluntary private subscription to supplement the funds to be provided by the federal government for the protection of Charleston.<sup>28</sup> The money thus

<sup>25</sup> In 1795-1796 he had bought on credit three plantations of tide lands with the negroes on them, costing above 29,000 pounds. In 1800 he was still heavily in debt on this account and under some pressure from his creditors. Letter of C. Pinckney to the editor, *Carolina Gazette*, October 9, 1800.

<sup>26</sup> Acknowledgment for data concerning Charles Pinckney and Alexander Gillon is due to Dr. Barnett A. Elzas of Charleston. Since this article was sent to press, a valuable discussion of Charles Pinckney has been published by Theodore D. Jervcy in the early chapters of his *Robert V. Hayne and his Times*. The publication of Mr. Jervcy's material necessitates no revision of the estimate of Pinckney here given.

<sup>27</sup> *A Short Account of the Principal Proceedings of Congress in the Late Session, and a Sketch of the State of Affairs between the United States and France in July 1798; in a Letter of Robert Goodloe Harper of South Carolina to One of his Constituents* (Philadelphia, August, 1798). For a letter of William Smith on the situation (written from Portugal) see *Sewanee Review*, XIV, 96.

<sup>28</sup> *Carolina Gazette*, May 10, 1798.

raised, amounting to about \$100,000, was used to build a frigate at Charleston in 1798-1799, which was christened the *John Adams*.<sup>29</sup> Foreigners were maltreated in some localities;<sup>30</sup> Henry W. De Saussure denounced the arrogance of France in the Fourth of July address at St. Philip's Church, Charleston; and Justice Bay took occasion in November upon his circuit in the counties of the upper Piedmont to deliver political charges to the grand juries, praising Adams, appealing for support to the administration and denouncing the recalcitrant few in South Carolina who had persisted in their partizan antagonism.<sup>31</sup>

But the Federalists had already prepared the way for their own downfall. The Alien and Sedition Acts of June and July, 1798, were an abuse of power which few Carolinians except Harper could defend. A sign of the reaction was the election of Charles Pinckney to the United States Senate in December, 1798. The pendulum of foreign relations, furthermore, swung to the Republican side. Charles Pinckney printed with good effect a series of well-written remonstrances against the overbearing policy of Great Britain.<sup>32</sup> Aside from these movements there was a lull in the local debate until the middle of the year 1800. Then, from June to November, the gazettes teemed with controversial articles, most of which were of Republican tone.

The issues presented in the general campaign were little different from those of 1796. The Federalist programme, in fact, was in several features identical. The party stood upon its record and not upon the promise of new policies. It again nominated a South Carolinian, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney in this case, to run with Adams; and Hamilton again tried to secure the election of Adams's companion candidate instead of Adams himself.

What has been said of Thomas Pinckney, a few pages above, applies with slight change of detail to his brother Charles Cotesworth. Their previous careers had been closely parallel; they were similarly devoid of records as party men but similarly distinguished for integrity, public spirit and high social standing; and they were similarly passive when they themselves were candidates. There is

<sup>29</sup> *Carolina Gazette*, May 23, 1799.

<sup>30</sup> *Columbian Museum* (Savannah, Georgia), January 23, 1798.

<sup>31</sup> *Carolina Gazette*, December 27, 1798.

<sup>32</sup> Printed first in the newspapers, then collected in a pamphlet: *Three Letters, written and originally published under the Signature of a South Carolina Planter: The first on the Case of Jonathan Robbins, . . . the second on the Recent Captures of American Vessels by British Cruisers, . . . the third on the Right of Expatriation, By Charles Pinckney, Esquire, Senator in Congress from South Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1799).

contemporary evidence that Charles Cotesworth Pinckney—repelled as unjust to Adams a proposal from men in control of the situation that a compromise between the two parties be adopted on the same plan as that which had been acted upon in 1796, and that the vote of South Carolina be given eight for Pinckney and eight for Jefferson.

The Federalists of the state allowed the election to go largely by default. Ralph Izard and William Smith were no longer in the arena, Thomas and C. C. Pinckney refrained from any electioneering; and worst of all, Robert Goodloe Harper had notified his constituents in a letter of May 15 that he would not run for Congress again and would not return for further residence in South Carolina. The local Federalists were leaderless—a new thing in their experience—handicapped by the record of the Alien and Sedition Acts, and generally powerless. The result of the contest hinged upon the work of one man, Charles Pinckney, whose exertions in Jefferson's and Burr's behalf were as marked as the inertness of the Adams and Pinckney men.

Charles Pinckney wrote a full account of his labors in the emergency in letters to Jefferson, which have been published in this journal.<sup>34</sup> The choice of electors was to be made, as usual in the state, by the legislature elected shortly before the presidential contest. Charleston sent in 1800, as usual, a majority of Federalists to the assembly (11 to 4), but the whole membership of the two houses on joint ballot promised to be very evenly divided. Charles Pinckney, instead of going to Washington for the opening of Congress, went to Columbia to manage the election of electors. By contesting the election of numerous members, and other jockeying, and by persuading such members as could be persuaded, he succeeded in swinging the majority. The assembly chose Republican electors by votes ranging from 82 to 87 as against 63 to 69 for the Federalist candidates. Pinckney then promptly wrote Jefferson requesting him not to "make any arrangements for this state" before consulting himself. The allusion was of course to the distribution of patronage.

Harper on the day after Jefferson's inauguration wrote as a farewell to his late constituents a eulogy of the constructive work performed by the Federalist party.<sup>35</sup> It was a splendid appreciation and fit to serve, as it did, as an obituary address. The gentry were

<sup>33</sup> AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, IV, 112, 113, 330.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 111-129.

<sup>35</sup> This was reprinted together with the other pamphlets herein mentioned in a volume: *Select Works of Robert Goodloe Harper*, vol. I., all published (Baltimore, 1814).

of course shocked by the triumph of Jefferson, and could adjust themselves to it only by retirement in injured dignity to private life.<sup>36</sup>

The Jeffersonian régime soon upset the whole adjustment of parties and their constitutional maxims. To the Republicans of 1801 the historical Republican doctrines were little more interesting than the last year's almanacs. The Northern wing of the Federalist party soon borrowed the arguments of strict construction in order to oppose the Louisiana Purchase, the embargo and the War of 1812; but the Carolina Federalists saw no occasion to follow this example. They accordingly did little but maintain their party machinery, in more or less isolation from parties outside the state. At the beginning of 1803 the *Charleston Courier* was established as a Federalist organ, denouncing in its editorials the French doctrines of the rights of man, etc., and praising conservatism and stability in government.<sup>37</sup> The editor soon began to complain of apathy in his party: "Sure some spell . . . hangs over the federalists. . . . If not for their own sakes, will they not for the salvation of their country rouse from the censurable sloth and fight the democrats?"<sup>38</sup> The Federalists locally would not arouse, for they had no issue for which to fight. The Jeffersonians had adopted the Federalist policies, and the South Carolina Federalists were drawn more and more into harmony with them and out of sympathy with the filibustering New Englanders. The older generation continued to cling passively to the name of Federalist. The *Charleston Courier* toned down and ceased to be a party organ. The sons of the gentry, William Lowndes, for example, drifted inevitably into the Republican party,<sup>39</sup> which was now no longer Democratic in the old doctrinaire sense, but was the one party of action. As a sign of the times even among the older group, William Smith, having returned from Portugal, went over to the Republicans and in 1810 tried to secure a nomination to Congress.<sup>40</sup> By force of the embargo and the British war, which they supported, the South Carolina Federalists gradually ceased to contend that they had a reason for separate existence, and they were gradually merged among the Republicans, who as a party accepted leaders largely from the gentry of the former Federalist families.

The Federalist party in the state was practically dead by 1812. The old Federalist policies, however, championed as they were by

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Mrs. St. Julien Ravenel, *Life of William Lowndes*, pp. 59 ff.

<sup>37</sup> *E. g.*, editorial of June 13, 1803.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, June 17, 1803.

<sup>39</sup> Mrs. St. Julien Ravenel, *Charleston, the Place and the People*, p. 379.

<sup>40</sup> E. S. Thomas, *Reminiscences*, II, 51, 57.

the new generation of leaders in spite of their repudiation of the party name and alignment, continued to control the state until about 1827. But the times again were changing, and men's opinions with them. Calhoun, Cheves, Lowndes and McDuffie had supported the national banks, Federal internal improvements and the protective tariff in the years of emergency at the close of the War of 1812, and had rejoiced in the opportunity of promoting the welfare of the manufacturing and wool-growing regions, so long as it did not obviously threaten injury to the people of their own state. But when the protected Northern and Western interests fattened and grew strong and used their strength to force through Congress bills for the further heightening of duties, and when it came to appear that the plantation states were entering a severe depression partly because of their previous generosity, the dominating sentiment among the people and the leaders in South Carolina reacted sharply against the so-called American system and against the constitutional theory which supported it. The Carolina statesmen, finding that the genie which they had loosed from his jar was threatening them and their people with oppression, resorted to the mystic (yet severely logical) formula of nullification in the hope of conjuring him back under control. Andrew Jackson's coercive proclamation, together with the Congressional force bills, established a decisive majority in the state in a position of resentment and reaction. The public appreciation of the impending crisis over negro slavery in the following period operated to make this attitude permanent. The Federalist policies were now not appreciably less dead in the state than was the old Federalist party organization.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.









2. *South Carolina Federalist Correspondence, 1789-1797*

THE following letters, mainly written by William Smith to Gabriel Manigault and Ralph Izard, are printed from the manuscripts in the possession of Mrs. Hawkins Jenkins, Wantoot Plantation (Pinopolis), St. John's, Berkeley, South Carolina.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

WILLIAM SMITH TO GABRIEL MANIGAULT.

NEW YORK June 7, 1789.

*Dear Sir:*

. . . Much harmony, politeness and good humor have hitherto prevailed in both houses—our debates are conducted with a moderation and ability extremely unusual in so large a body—consisting of men under the influence of such jarring interests coming from such different countries and climates and accustomed to such different manners. How long this delightful accommodation will continue is uncertain: I sincerely wish I shall never see it interrupted . . .

R. has given me battle on the plains of N. Y. after suffering a defeat at Charleston; I have fortunately given him as complete an overthrow here as I did there,<sup>1</sup> and I hope he will let me alone.

RALPH IZARD TO EDWARD RUTLEDGE.

NEW YORK 26th Sept. 1789.

*Dear Sir:*

I am just returned from the Senate where the following Officers have been approved of—Mr. Jay Chief Justice: Judges of the Supreme Court J. Rutledge, Cushing, Wilson, Harrison, and Blair. Edmund Randolph Attorney General, Major Pinckney<sup>2</sup> is appointed District Judge for South Carolina. The Judges both of the Supreme Court and the District Courts are chosen from among the most eminent and distinguished characters in America, and I do not believe that any Judiciary in the world is better filled. The President asked me before the nominations were made, whether I thought your Brother John, Genl. Pinckney,<sup>3</sup> or yourself would accept of a Judge in the Supreme Court. I told him that I was not authorized to say you would not, but intimated that the office of Chief Justice would be most suitable to either of you: That however was engaged. Mr. Jay's Office has this day been filled by Mr. Jefferson, who is expected here soon from France. The home Department is added to it, and the name of the office changed. Mr. Jefferson is called Secretary of State. I hope it may suit your Brother to accept, if it should be only for two or three years; as it is of the first importance that the Judiciary should be highly respectable. The Office of District Judge I hope will be agreeable to Major Pinckney. If either of them should refuse to accept, let me know of it by the first opportunity, and tell me whom you wish to be appointed that will accept. The President will not nominate any but the most eminent: and if none in South Carolina of that description will accept, he will be obliged to have recourse to some other state. I write this letter in a hurry hoping that it may be in time to go by Capt. Freneau. Your son is above stairs drinking tea with the Ladies. I never saw him look so well. He is not absolutely fat; but as near it as you would wish him to be.

I am Dear Sir

Your most ob<sup>t</sup>. Servt.

RA . . . IZARD.

RALPH IZARD TO EDWARD RUTLEDGE.

NEW YORK December 29th 1789.

*Dear Sir*

I have already written to you by this opportunity. Capt. Motley's being detained by contrary winds and bad weather gives me an opportunity of again urging you to procure and send me as soon as possible the sentiments of the members of the Legislature upon the subject of the adoption of our state debt by Congress. If a vote in favor of the measure could be obtained, it would put it in my power to speak with

<sup>1</sup> The allusion is to David Ramsay's unsuccessful contest of Smith's election to Congress.

<sup>2</sup> *I. e.*, Thomas Pinckney.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Cotesworth Pinckney.

greater confidence than by being possessed simply of the opinion of individuals. I am fully persuaded that it would be of infinite advantage to our State if the measure should be adopted. I have written to Mr. John Hunter, the Member from Little River District on the subject. He is a man of whom I think well; perhaps it may be useful for you to confer with him. When I consider the great loss of time which for several years we have experienced in debating about indents, and many other circumstances which must occur to you, I do not think it possible that you should differ with me on this subject. I am extremely sorry however to find that my Colleague<sup>1</sup> continues to do so, and I am told that some of our members in the House of Representatives are in sentiment with him. Congress will meet in a few days; but I think the business I have mentioned to you will not be decided until I receive an answer to this letter. Henry is well, is now with me; has this morning received your letter by Capt. Elliot, and says that he intends writing to you by him next week. This will probably find you at Columbia. I hope most sincerely that I may not be mistaken in thinking it will not be for the happiness of the people at large that the Legislature should continue to sit there. Remember me to all friends, and believe me

sincerely Yours etc

RA . . . IZARD.

WILLIAM SMITH TO GABRIEL MANIGAULT.

NEW YORK March 26, 1790.

*Dear Manigault,*

I am not surprised at your anxiety on the question respecting the assumption of the State debts; we are no less agitated about it and are apprehensive of the issue, tho we think it must finally take place; the opposition to it is considerable and the arrival of the North Carolina Members an inauspicious event, as they are expected to be against it. Two of them have taken their seats—one is very warmly opposed to it and the other doubtful—two others are daily expected. The Committee of the whole have agreed to it by a majority of five but should all the North Carolina members vote against us, the result will perhaps be fatal.

Some memorials from the Quakers and the Penylva<sup>a</sup>. Society for the abolition of Slavery which were presented to our House have thrown us into a flame which is now fortunately extinguished after a considerable loss of time—two unmeaning resolutions have been passed to gratify the memorialists, (Who are much displeased with them by the bye) and we obtained an explicit declaration that Congress have no power to interfere with the emancipation of slaves. The Quakers are gone home much discontented and the House has been censured by the public for taking up the business.

WILLIAM SMITH TO GABRIEL MANIGAULT.

NEW YORK, Augt. 3, 1790.

*Dear Manigault,*

I have pleasure in congratulating you on the Assumption, a meas-

<sup>1</sup> Pierce Butler.

ure not only beneficial to the U. S. and to So. Car. particularly, but to yourself personally, a circumstance which adds much to the satisfaction I have felt. Although we have not assumed to the full amount of each debt and have not funded the Debt at a full six per cent, yet, considering the very violent opposition to the measure we must be satisfied for the present with what has been done: at the next session in December we shall probably do more.

We shall adjourn in the course of a few days, as soon as we have past a Bill raising a revenue for the continental debt; this is intended to be by an addition to the impost; the Excise will be reserved for the State debts, the Interest on which will commence 1st Jan'y 1792,—a year after the other.

WILLIAM SMITH TO GABRIEL MANIGAULT.

PHILAD<sup>a</sup>. Dec. 19, 1790.

*Dear Manigault,*

. . . The punctuality of the members has been such that we were within *one* of forming a quorum of both houses on the *first* day, a circumstance well worthy of note. We have today got over all preparatory ceremonies and shall now go seriously to work. I cannot foretell whether the Campaign will be a bloody one or not—it has opened with ominous circumstances; by taking the field at a season when other combatants go into winter quarters. Many of our Champions have from the combined inconveniences of tempestuous weather and bad roads met with terrible disasters in repairing to the Camp. Burke was shipwrecked off the Capes; Jackson and Mathews with great difficulty landed at Cape May and travelled 160 miles in a wagon to the City. Burke got here in the same way. Gerry and Partridge were overset in the stage; the first had his head broke and made his Entree with an enormous black patch; the other had his ribs sadly bruised and was unable to stir for some days. Tucker had a dreadful passage of 16 days with perpetual storms. I wish these little contretemps may not sour their tempers and be inauspicious to our proceedings. Secretary Hamilton made his report this morning on the further support of public credit. He recommends an Excise as the most eligible mode of funding the State Debts; we are to consider this report Monday next. The Enemies to the Assumption will of course oppose this scheme and avail themselves of the Terrors of the Excise to make it obnoxious: but I believe we may be safe in relying on this fund; for the faith of the national Legislat<sup>r</sup>. is pledged for the pay<sup>t</sup>. of the interest of the State debts, and the Excise will be found on discussion to be the only source to which we can resort.

GEORGE CABOT TO RALPH IZARD (at Hartford, Connecticut).

BROOKLINE Aug<sup>t</sup>. 19th 1794.

*My dear friend*

I was rejoiced to read in your own hand writing that you and Mrs. Izard are well and happy.

I am not so good a farmer as you wish me to be but am agreeably employed and shall improve my agricultural talents in good time.

The newspapers will show you that in this part of the country our

political character grows worse and that the combination of Fools with Knaves must eventually be too powerful for the friends of genuine liberty—jacobin principles are congenial with the feelings of the weak and the wicked, but the defence of order and good government without which there can be no equal liberty, requires capacity, integrity and the sacrifice of personal ease. You will perceive readily that I am as much out of humour as ever. I am so desponding that I cannot be useful and if it were not for a strong sense of obligation to others I should certainly resign my public employment.

I look forward however with satisfaction to the period of my service and with some secret hopes that I may without impropriety end it in another session. Mrs. Cabot requires me to assure you and Mrs. Izard of her most affectionate sentiments toward your family in which I pray you to unite your sincere

and faithful friend  
GEORGE CABOT.

WILLIAM SMITH TO RALPH IZARD.\*

PHILAD. May 18th, 96.

*Dear Sir:*

The Senate have resolved not to admit the State of Tennessee at present; but to lay out the Territory into a State by act of Congress and order the Census to be taken by federal Authority, the return to be made to the President, who will cause a new Convention to be held and other proceed<sup>gs</sup>. preparatory to their admittance at the next session. Langdon was sent for on that account, and I believe to assist at a caucus about Vice President: it seems the party are at a stand on that point: the persons in nomination are Burr, Langdon, Butler and Chanf. Livingston; the latter is said to stand highest having gained much reputation in Virginia by *Cato* against the Treaty. Butler, they say, they have no objection to except being a Southern man and as Jefferson is to be President, it won't do: Burr, they think unsettled in his politics and are afraid he will go over to the other side: Langdon has no influence etc.

Our side are also unsettled. Some think that the run will be for Adams or Jefferson as President and as they will be the two highest, and neither will serve as Vice P. there will be *no Vice P.*: this will probably be the issue. The publication you sent me is a paltry performance. I showed it to King who laughed at it: he has given me some extracts from Major Pinckney's correspond. on the subject, which I will communicate to you when we meet.

Major P. has written me a Letter from London, introducing Mr. Lister in warm terms, which he seems to merit.

I called on Mr. Boyd yesterday about the pills: he remembers you and the kind of pills you want; they shall be sent by the first opport<sup>y</sup>. I have sett<sup>d</sup>. with Mr. Hill and Mr. Vaughan.

Present my affe<sup>d</sup>. respects to Mr<sup>s</sup>. Izard and believe me,

Dear Sir  
with aff and resp<sup>t</sup>.  
yours etc

WM. SMITH

\* Senator Izard was Smith's father-in-law.

I must rescue one Virginian *Hancock*, from your strictures: He has behaved nobly, in resisting so formid<sup>l</sup>, a phalanx: Grove too deserves great credit.

WILLIAM SMITH TO RALPH IZARD.

PHILAD. NOV. 3. 96.

Dear Sir,

Since my last, Mr. Adet has delivered a note to the Secretary of State, which with the Secretary's reply I send you by this post. Every circumstance accompanying the Note, convinces us that it is altogether designed as an electioneering manoeuvre; the govern<sup>t</sup>, and every respectable character viewed it in that light.

The proceeding is so barefaced and such an outrageous and open interference in our most important election that it disgusts every reflecting and independ<sup>t</sup>, man and will I trust have an effect directly the reverse of that w<sup>ch</sup> is so palpably intended. The note was dated the 27<sup>th</sup>. Thursday, and was deliv<sup>d</sup>, to the Sec<sup>y</sup>. of State either that day or the day following; the President was expected here on Monday (31<sup>st</sup>.); but before he could receive it from the Secretary, Adet sent it to Bache to be printed, and it appeared in his infamous paper on the Monday morning before the President arrived, w<sup>ch</sup> was in the afternoon, and therefore before he saw it, unless he met Bache's paper on the road, when he must have had the first view of the note in that paper. This morning Pinckney's<sup>s</sup> answer appeared and has given much satisfaction; the circumstances he mentions of the Directory having declared to Monroe that there was no Decree affecting our commerce on the 28<sup>th</sup>. Aug<sup>t</sup>. and Adet's threatening us with this Decree dated 2<sup>d</sup>. July, is a corroborating circumstance to prove the design of alarming the People at this crisis. Tho the President was expected so soon, he could not have the decency to wait his arrival, but sent his note to be published, lest it might not operate enough before the election; by publishing it on Monday, it was just in time to influence the Election in this State, which takes place tomorrow. The day on which it came out in Bache's paper, appeared in that paper a great display of the force of France, certainly calculated to have an effect with the note: two days after, came a piece, threat<sup>s</sup>. us with war with France, unless we elect a President, who will be agreeable to that nation: These are among the abominable artifices practised to secure french election in this State and so great have been the exertions employed, such the Lies spread all thro the country against Mr. A. that I apprehend the antip<sup>t</sup>. ticket will prevail, in w<sup>ch</sup> case Jeff<sup>n</sup>. will have 15 votes in this State: libels have been circulated all thro the State asserting that A. has declared himself for a King; in some he is called King Adams, in others they state the question to be, whether we wish to have a King or a President, etc. Still as the votes will probably be unanim<sup>y</sup>. for A. in the East<sup>n</sup>. States New York and Jersey and Delaware and gener<sup>y</sup>. in Maryland, if he has a few votes in the Southern States, he will be elected: the greatest exertions are therefore necessary: one or two votes in S. C. may save the election.

I send you a pamphlet containing the Letters of Phocion, under

<sup>a</sup> Charles Cotesworth Pinckney.



another title; our friends here have had them printed, with an expectation that they will do good, and they will be circulated thro' the Southern States, before the Election.

Every man must lend his aid to save the Country at this important juncture; I hope you have decided to go to Columbia.

B. Smith writes me from No. Car, that he hopes A. will have some votes in that State; if so I think we shall be saved; he informs me that he has heard from F. Rutledge, who, if an elector, will *not* vote for A. I suspect he is tampering with my Cousin, but he won't succeed with him.

Steele, the Comptroller, is very decidedly with us, and very useful in circulating information, and writing to his friends.

I wrote you by Story Junr. a few days ago. Butler and his family are gone with Story Senr. I long to hear of his projects in S.C.

Remem<sup>r</sup>. me, if you please, affect. to all friends, and believe me

Dr. Sir

With sincere esteem

Yours etc

WM. SMITH.

ROBERT GOODLOE HARPER TO RALPH IZARD (at Charleston, South Carolina).

RALEIGH No. CAROLINA, Nov. 4th 1796.

*Dear Sir,*

I take the liberty of addressing you on some subjects the importance of which will apologize for the trouble I shall give you.

The first is the election of President. I find the people in our upper Country generally disposed in favor of Jefferson. 'Tis nearly the same case here; even in a greater degree. Mr. Adams may probably get some votes in each State, but the number will be small, for the lower country of our State, with some few exceptions, are more warm on Jefferson's subject than the upper. Should the Pennsylvania Election for Electors succeed, Adams will outpoll Jefferson; otherwise he will most probably be far behind.

As to Pinckney,<sup>1</sup> the case is entirely different. He, I am well assured, will receive a vote from every elector, or nearly every one, in the three southern states; and in Virginia also I have reason to believe he will meet with considerable support. He, I think is our sheet anchor. It is not Pinckney or Adams with us, but Pinckney or Jefferson.

The great point is to prevail on Pinckney to stand. Every effort will be used by his pretended friends, and by Ned Rutledge among the rest, to persuade him not to let his name be run. They will tell him that he ought not to act as vice President, that he is intended to be made a tool of, by people who will deceive him. That he is brought forward to divide the votes of the southern states, and that the eastern people, when it comes to the truth will not support him. If he should not arrive before the election, Ned Rutledge will give out that his friend Major Pinckney, in whose most intimate confidence he will declare himself to be, will not consent to serve as vice-President. By these means if possible, under the mask of friendship, they will pre-

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Pinckney.

vent him from being voted for. But Major Pinckney may be assured, I speak from the most certain knowledge, that the intention of bringing him forward was to make him President, and that he will be supported with that view. I do not say that the eastern people would prefer him to Mr. Adams; but they infinitely prefer him to Jefferson, and they support him because it gives them an additional chance to exclude Jefferson, and to get a man whom they can trust. With the very same views against Adams is Pinckney supported by many of Jefferson's warmest friends; and there are not wanting many who prefer him to either. Upon the whole I have no doubt of his being elected, if it should not be prevented by himself or those who call themselves his friends. The great point is to prevail on him to stand.

I trust these ideas sir to your discretion. You may make any such use of them as you think proper. You know the persons who ought to be applied to on this subject. Gen<sup>l</sup>. Pinckney's<sup>\*</sup> absence is a great loss; but there are others who may be usefully addressed. I do not know how DeSaussure stands respecting Jefferson; indeed it is very difficult to know how he stands on any subject; but if he should enter into our views, there is no man in the state whom you may consult to more advantage. He is intimate with the leading men of all sides, and knows how to address them in the most effectual manner. He stands very high in the confidence of several.

The next subject is the choice of a governor and senator for our state. While I was in the upper country I was told that Butler<sup>9</sup> intended to resign and offer as governor and that Hunter was to supply his place in the senate. I need not tell you the importance of defeating this scheme; particularly the latter part of it, and it can only be defeated by bringing forward reputable and popular candidates in opposition. Butler has lost ground in the upper country, but is still strong; particularly with the members of the Legislature. He will also meet with no inconsiderable support from below. I know no man who could oppose him with success but Washington<sup>10</sup> or John Ewing Calhoun. The upper country people, I believe, would vote for Washington, many of them at least, in preference to Butler, and I believe Calhoun would get more votes below. I should however think Washington a safer candidate; but De Saussure, if he will, can give you a much better judgement on this subject. There is also a young man of the name of Mitchell, William B. Mitchell, who from his familiar acquaintance among the members may be usefully consulted.

As to Hunter, should he offer, I know no-body who can so well oppose him as Dr. Ramsay.<sup>11</sup> There is an objection to him among the planters, and but one. That perhaps may be got over. It is his principles respecting slavery. He has of late become a considerable slave-holder in Georgia, which I suppose will be a sufficient security. At any rate he will unite the middle country, and the Charleston interest, and will receive a number of votes from above. His offering would hold Ephraim Ramsay in check, who is the ablest most artful and most dangerous of all the supporters of antifederalism in South Carolina.

<sup>\*</sup> Charles Cotesworth Pinckney.

<sup>9</sup> Pierce Butler, then Congressman.

<sup>10</sup> General William A. Washington, a prominent planter.

<sup>11</sup> David B. Ramsay.

Charles Pinckney will probably offer for one place or the other. I need not say that he is as much to be avoided as either of the others. I would rather see him governor than senator, and should prefer him to Butler in the former capacity. It perhaps might be well enough to make him governor;<sup>12</sup> bad as he would be, to prevent him from becoming senator. The greatest danger in his offering as senator would be in the probability of its preventing Ramsay from coming forward, or if he should offer, affording a rallying point to the opposition which he would be likely to receive from the planters below.

There is general Anderson in the back Country, who stands high there, and might be a fit man perhaps to oppose to Butler as governor. He would by no means do for senator; but in the former station he is far less objectionable than either Butler or Pinckney. If Pickens can be prevailed on to offer there is certainty of his success. Perhaps Robert Barnwell might be persuaded to offer as senator. If so, his election I think would be certain.

These ideas sir have appeared to me to be of importance. Should you consider them in the same light, you will excuse the trouble I have given you in communicating them, and accept the sincere respect with which I have the honor to be

Your very obl. servt.  
ROB: G: HARPER.

WILLIAM SMITH TO RALPH IZARD (at Charleston, South Carolina).

PHILAD. Nov. 8, 96.

*Dear Sir*

Since my last, the Election for Electors has taken place in this State: in the City and County, the antifederal Ticket has unfortunately prevailed by a very large majority; in the other counties from which we have heard, the federal Ticket is considerably ahead, but we have to apprehend a majority against us in the Western Counties, so that upon the whole, the issue is very doubtful and the chances rather against us. In this case there will be 15 votes for Jeff<sup>n</sup>, in this State, which will decide the election unless we have a respectable support in the Southern States.

The causes which have produced this success of the Jacobins in this City and environs as as disgusting as the thing itself. One was the infamous calumny propagated with wonderful industry, that Mr. Adams was for a King, and accordingly on the election ground the Mob were shouting "Jefferson and no king". Another was a momentary alarm excited among the Quakers, who have been heretofore right, by Adet's threats: they conceived that France was about to declare war against us and that Jeff<sup>n</sup>, would conciliate the affections of that nation; and thus a scandalous manoeuvre, evidently designed to influence the election has had its effect: and thus, after the federal party have by great wisdom and exertions preserved peace with England, they are now to be kicked aside as useless, and their adversaries brought in to keep peace with France, and those who created the Constitution and produced the prosperity the Nation now enjoys are

<sup>12</sup> Charles Pinckney was in fact elected governor in 1796.

<sup>13</sup> General Andrew Pickens, Congressman, 1793-1795.

to be trampled under foot by the Enemies of the Constit<sup>n</sup>. and of the national prosp<sup>y</sup>.

Another cause which I hope will damn Jeff<sup>n</sup>, in the Southern States operated strongly with many of the Quakers; that is, his wishes for *emancipation*. French influence never appeared so open and unmasked as at this city election—French flags, french cockades were displayed by the Jefferson party and there is no doubt that french money was not spared. Public houses were kept open. At Kensington the mob would suffer no person to vote who had not a french cockade in his hat. In the northern liberties, there were many hundred votes given more than at any former election all of which are supposed to be illegal. In short there never was so barefaced and disgraceful an interference of a foreign power in any free country.

McKean leads the antifederal ticket. You remem<sup>r</sup>. his zeal for Adams at the last election, and yet to serve the vile purposes of a party, the old wretch submits to prostitute his vote, having promised to vote for Jeff<sup>n</sup>, tho he is known in his heart, to prefer Adams's politics.—Burr is here—he has been at Boston and is probably going to the southward—he is to be run on the antifederal ticket with Jeff<sup>n</sup>, in some of the states; tho I believe the party are not perfectly agreed among themselves as to the Vice Presid<sup>t</sup>.—the plan of the leading men, I am told, is to vote for Jefferson and any other man, except Adams and Pinckney, and instructions have been issued to that effect; they forbid the voting for P. lest he sh<sup>d</sup>. get in as President; they think that Ad. may get in as V. P. and they are sure he would resign, which would furnish them with materials of abuse for his hauteur, in despising a station in which the people have placed him. Burr is likely however to unite most of the antif<sup>d</sup>. votes—a charming character to be sure for V. President! so unpopular in his own state that he can't even get a seat in the State Legislature—sued here for 5,000 doll. at the Bank and in N. Y. for £12,000 Sterl<sup>g</sup>. for a land speculation. Old Robinson of Vermont has resigned and Tichenor, a federalist, elected. Buck re-elected in that state unanim<sup>y</sup>. and Lyon expected to succeed my namesake, so that the *Green Mountains* will be represented very properly by a *Buck* and a *Lion*. Otis will succeed Ames.

I suppose you have read Adet's note and Pickering's reply—Adet is preparing a rejoinder which will appear in a few days: all this is well understood—and his success in this City will doubtless encourage him to persevere.

Harper, I find is reelected by a great majority, and I hear that J. Rutledge is elected. Harper writes Bingham that he thinks Adams will have three votes in So. Car. Could it not be intimated to E. Rutledge that if Jeff<sup>n</sup>, gets any votes in our State, he will outvote Pinckney and therefore those who wish P—y's election as President ought not to vote for Jeff<sup>n</sup>. This idea may induce him to withdraw his support from J. even tho he sh<sup>d</sup>. not support A. and wo<sup>d</sup>. favor our cause.

I hope the family are all well—remember me to them  
and believe me Dear Sir with sincere Esteem

Yours respect<sup>y</sup>.

WM. SMITH.

WILLIAM SMITH TO RALPH IZARD

PHILADELPHIA, May 23, 97

Dear Sir

The newspapers will acquaint you of the subjects of discussion which arose out of the reported answer to the address. It was a fortunate thing that Rutledge<sup>1</sup> was one of the select committee; we strongly suspect that the Speaker by placing him there counted on him as being on the other side. Venable was chairman and had Rutledge been wrong, the draft V. had prepared would have been reported; the draft was a most pusillanimous crouching thing, hoping every thing from further negotiations. We had a large meeting after the com<sup>tee</sup> was formed, at which were present Griswold, Rutledge and Kittera, composing a majority of the com<sup>tee</sup>, and there we agreed on the sketch of a draft, which Griswold prepared and was agreed to in the com<sup>tee</sup>, and reported. Nicholas's amend<sup>t</sup>. will, I think, be lost, but I fear there will be some change in the reported answer, which will not improve it. Coit has proposed some conciliatory amendm<sup>ts</sup>., which the federal party generally dislike, and which the other party will prefer to the report. His amend<sup>ts</sup>. are 1. to express a wish "that the F. Rep. may stand on grounds as favorable as any other nations in their relations to the U. S." 2. to change the expression of *indignation* at the rejection of our minister, into one of *surprise* and *regret*. 3<sup>d</sup>. to state the attempts of France to wound our rights and to separate the people from the govern<sup>t</sup> *hypothetically*, "should such attempts be made." "if such sentiments are entertained". I am apprehensive the first of these amend<sup>ts</sup>. will be agreed to—there is a pretty general opinion that we can have no great objection to placing France on the same footing as Eng., but we conceive that inserting these words will be interfering with the Executive—will be an oblique censure on their past conduct, will be an admission that France has a right to this concession, and be throwing out of view any hope of compensation for spoliation.

Every manoeuvre was practised to seduce Rutledge and bring him over on the com<sup>tee</sup>, to vote for Venable's draft, but he stood out and was decidedly for a high-toned report. He has twice spoken in the house against Nicholas's amend<sup>t</sup>.—his last speech yesterday was a very good one; it was argumentative, ingenious and sarcastic and had much effect; he delivered himself with ease, fluency and grace; he has very much the manner of his Uncle Edward; the federal party and the audience were highly pleased and the french faction prodigiously mortified, except at one part of his speech (which might as well have been omitted) respecting the British Treaty. We have several n. w. members, young and genteel men, all federal and handsome speakers, Otis, Dennis (the successor of Murray) Bayard the Delaware member, and Rutledge. Otis and Bayard are very powerful and Dennis, tho' very young very well informed and decided. Evans, successor of Page, is a very federal and respectable man; he proposed rather a foolish amend<sup>t</sup>. at the outset, from a spirit of conciliation but he will be generally right. Old Morgan, in lieu of Rutherford, is very firm in support of gov<sup>t</sup>.

Some of the Jacobins are rather softened, but the leaders are as fierce and obstinate as ever. Giles, Gallatin, Nicholas, Livingston,

<sup>1</sup> John Rutledge the younger, a new member from South Carolina.

Swanwick and Sam Smith have disgraced the country by their speeches; Giles and Livingston were hours in apologizing for France and abusing the govern<sup>t</sup>. of this country and the British Treaty; but Sam S. who spoke yesterday, surpassed them all; his whole speech consisted of invectives against British spoliations and justification of France: Harper,<sup>15</sup> who is the most decided and bitter enemy of the French, gave him a severe dressing and made a very able speech; before he had however completed his remarks, the Speaker was taken ill and the house adjourned; Harper will continue tomorrow; he sat with me an hour last night and from his conversation, he appears full charged. He is a very bold speaker and is very industrious; he will be a very important character in that house in a short time. Gallatin was more decent than usual and his speech *more american* than that of any of the others.

My namesake Major W. Smith is arrived; he looks like a thin puritanical Methodist, is rather an elderly man and appears to be a great simpleton. He lodges with Rutledge and Hunter. On his arrival he expressed himself to Rutledge satisfied with the report of the Com<sup>ee</sup>, but Sumter<sup>16</sup> got him seated in the house between him and Milledge, and they together with Baldwin have been debauching him. Harper had him to dinner two days ago, together with Rutledge, Bayard, Otis and myself; we tried to infuse good opinions into him, but he appears to be composed of materials very unpromising.

It is unfortunate that so much time should be spent in debating the answer; but it was unavoidable; all this debate must have come out during the session and it was perhaps better to have it at the beginning and disencumber the measures, which will be proposed, of this extraneous matter. When this question is settled, which will probably be tomorrow, we shall immed<sup>y</sup>. proceed to the measures necessary for defence. Opinions are not made up; the greatest objection seems to lie against allowing the merchant ships to be armed; the Jacobins will object to everything like defence, for fear of irritating; but I presume they will be in the minority; fortifications, completing the Frigates, purchasing and fitting out armed vessels, as convoys, procuring arms and ammunition are the most likely to succeed. Gen. Pinckney will be appointed as *sole* Envoy or Embass. Extr<sup>y</sup>.—perhaps some important character sent as Secr<sup>y</sup>. of the Embassy. The party have relinquished their hopes of Madison: they found a general approbation of Pinckney's conduct and understood that the President's mind was made up; after intimat<sup>g</sup>. various objections against him they now make a merit of necessity and join in applause.

Jefferson's letter is uncontradicted; I had some conversat<sup>n</sup>. with Harper about it last night, and he says he will introduce the subject in his speech tomorrow. Jefferson lodges at Francis's hotel with a knot of Jacobins, Baldwin, Sumter, Varnum, Brown, Skinner (successor of Sedgewick) they have unluckily got Henry amongst them, and I much fear will corrupt him, as he is a weak man and has given already a wrong vote in the Senate.

There has been some objection in the Senate to the President's nomination of Mr. Adams to Berlin, *only* on the score of extending foreign relations. The appointment will however take place, and the

<sup>15</sup> Robert Goodloe Harper, of South Carolina.

<sup>16</sup> General Thomas Sumter, of South Carolina.

previous question carried 18 to 11 then the nom<sup>l</sup>. agreed to. Day before yesterday the nomination was made of Gen. Pinckney, Chief Justice Dana of Massac<sup>tts</sup>, and Gen. Marshall of Virginia (the celebrated lawyer) as envoys Extr<sup>a</sup>, and Min. Plen. to France. I had heard of this [project] several days ago and objected to it and in conseq<sup>ce</sup>. of my objection [the] nominations were postponed two days and the subject reconsidered by the Presi<sup>d</sup>[ent] and council; but there were reasons for it too powerful in their opinions to change th<sup>e</sup> plan -- I dislike it -- however, it is done. I immedi<sup>ly</sup> took measures to satisfy Rutledge and he is perfectly satisfied: [ ] has shown much ill humour and endeav<sup>d</sup>. to prejudice Rut. but I was before hand. G<sup>l</sup>. Pinckney is at the head of the commission and will I hope be pleased with the arrangement.

Yesterday morn<sup>g</sup>. I called on Porcupine and paid him a visit; he was much delighted with the anecdote respecting St. Peter; he laughed very heartily; I read him your remarks about Webster; he acquiesces in the propriety. I dined yesterday with the President; he was easy and cheerful; suffic<sup>ly</sup>. familiar without losing his dignity; Mrs. Adams conducted herself with the greatest propriety. The dinner was genteel, without profusion; the wine rather mediocre. In the evening I related the anecdote about St. Peter. They were much pleased with it. Porcupine is a great favorite at Court.

I shall write again soon. Tell Harry that his friend Cochran is a very clever fellow; he has not spoke yet, but his opinions are very sound.

I hope the children are getting well from the hooping cough. Pray give my love to them.

Very respec<sup>ly</sup>.

Yours etc  
WM. SMITH.







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 418 443 9

Hollinger Corp.  
pH 8.5